

Please note that the female characteristic is used first for the differentiation. *T. wickeni* is based on females only, and Ali & Prabha (1974) added male characteristics in the generic diagnosis of *Indodorylaimus* because they thought that their species with males was *T. wickeni*.

The genus *Indodorylaimus* may, or may not, be a valid genus, but another species viz., *Indodorylaimus elongatus* Baqri, 1982 (= *Indodorylaimus wickeni* apud Ali & Prabha, 1974) could not and should not be designated as the type species of *Indodorylaimus* Ali & Prabha, as discussed above.

(2) By Dr Q. H. Baqri (Zoological Survey of India, Calcutta, 700016, India)

In reply to the above comment by M. R. Siddiqi, nowhere in my application have I stated that the generic diagnosis of *Indodorylaimus* Ali & Prabha, 1974 is inadequate or that the description provided by the authors is poor. Rather, I have clearly stated that the type specimens of *Thornenema wickeni* Yeates, 1970 were compared with Ali & Prabha's specimens and the latter were found different in many characters. Hence, the specimens on which *Indodorylaimus* Ali & Prabha, 1974 was based were misidentified.

The species that was before Ali & Prabha had no valid name and was found to be a new species. In the circumstances (Article 49), I named the species *Indodorylaimus elongatus* Baqri, 1982 (= *I. wickeni* apud Ali & Prabha, 1974) and designated it as type species of *Indodorylaimus*. Article 72d has the provision that if an author proposes a new specific name expressly as a replacement for a prior name, it retains the type of the taxon bearing the prior name. Hence, Ali & Prabha's specimens were retained as types with the replaced name.

Articles 41, 49, 65b, 67j, and 70a deal with the misidentification of type species. Mayer, E. in his *Principles of Systematic Zoology*, p. 370, states that the principle on which such corrections (misidentification of types) are based is that the type of a taxon is not a name but the zoological object. The type (species or genus) is then the zoological object which the original author had before him (when making the type designation) and not the name which he may have erroneously attached to this object.

In light of the above, I find it rather difficult to accept the objection raised by Dr Siddiqi. To me it seems that Article 68a of the International Code is not applicable under the circumstances.

PROPOSAL TO EMEND Z.N.(S.) 2401 BY DESIGNATING *APIS PILIPES* AS TYPE SPECIES OF *MEGILLA* FABRICIUS

By Charles D. Michener (Department of Entomology, University of Kansas,
Lawrence, Kansas 66045, U.S.A.)

One aspect of a recent proposal (Michener, 1983) urged suppression of the first designation of a type species of the genus *Megilla* Fabricius, 1805. This action would validate the designation of *Apis acervorum* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Megilla* by Richards, 1935. My proposal was made with the objective of placing *Megilla* as a junior synonym of *Anthophora* Latreille, 1803.

I now realise that *Apis acervorum* Linnaeus has usually been misidentified. Day, 1979, places it as a species of *Bombus* Latreille, 1802, without a firm decision as to which one. (The type is believed lost). Løken (1973) places it in synonymy of *B. subterraneus* Linnaeus, 1758, without detailed explanation or neotype designation, and Day, 1979, so places it on page 81. Thomson, 1872, in a major work, also placed *Apis acervorum* as a synonym of *subterraneus* but most subsequent authors did not follow him.

The misidentification of *Apis acervorum* Linnaeus is of long standing, starting with Fabricius (1775), who referred to the ferruginous hind tibiae, a feature of *Anthophora* 'acervorum' but not of *Bombus subterraneus* or other *Bombus* species that could be the one named *acervorum* by Linnaeus. The misidentification was so generally accepted that Dalla Torre, 1896, cited 20 references to *acervorum* under *Anthophora* or genera synonymous with it and many others have appeared since 1896. It is obvious that Richards (1935), in designating *Apis acervorum* Linnaeus as the type species of *Megilla*, had the generally accepted misidentification in mind, for he indicated that *Megilla* would become a synonym of *Anthophora*, not of *Bombus*.

My original proposal would leave *Megilla* (which has not appeared in primary zoological literature in this century except to replace a homonym in 1916; see Michener, 1983) available to replace one or another subgeneric name in *Bombus* (e.g., *Subterraneobombus* Vogt, 1911, type species *Apis subterranea* Linnaeus, 1758 =? *A. acervorum* Linnaeus, 1758), depending on decisions as to the identity of *Apis acervorum* Linnaeus. Nothing would be gained by destabilizing the subgeneric names of *Bombus* in this way.

I therefore emend my proposal (Michener, 1983) to request the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to designate *Apis pilipes* Fabricius, 1775, as the type species of *Megilla* Fabricius, 1805, and to invalidate all previous type designations for this genus. *A. pilipes* was one of the originally included species in *Megilla*. It is a synonym of *Apis plumipes* Pallas, 1772, which is the valid name for the *Apis acervorum* of authors, not Linnaeus, 1758. This designation will therefore accomplish Richards' intent as well as preserve the current usage of *Subterraneobombus* and *Macropis*.

REFERENCES

- DALLA TORRE, C. G. DE 1896. *Catalogus Hymenopterorum* vol. 10, Apidae (Anthophila), viii+643 pp.
- DAY, M. C. 1979. The species of Hymenoptera described by Linnaeus in the genera *Sphex*, *Chrysis*, *Vespa*, *Apis* and *Mutilla*. *Biol. J. Linnean Soc.* London vol. 12, pp. 45-84.
- FABRICIUS, J. C. 1775. *Systema Entomologiae*. Flensburgi and Lipsiae 8+30+832 pp.
- LØKEN, A. 1973. Studies on Skandinavian bumble bees. *Norsk entomol. Tidsk.* vol. 20, pp. 1-218.
- MICHENER, C. D. 1983. Proposal to suppress the first designation of a type species for the generic name *Megilla* Fabricius, 1805, and to place *Macropis* Klug, 1809, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology. *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 40, pp. 207-208.